



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,494	08/18/2003	Koji Motoyama	0033-0897P	1856

2292 7590 06/13/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

KHAN, SUHAIL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/642,494	MOTOYAMA, KOJI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Suhail Khan	2617	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                         |                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                             | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application EP 0718964 A2 to Kennan, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6538533 to Hwang et al and U.S. Patent No. 4922211 to Otremba et al.

Referring to **claim 1**, Kennan discloses a low noise block down converter (col 1, lines 5-10, Low Noise Block Downconverters), comprising: a plurality of local oscillators (col 2, lines 13-15, two FET oscillators) with applied potential to the input (col 3, lines 9-12, potential) each including a dielectric resonator (col 2, lines 15-20, dielectric resonator) and having an oscillation frequency different from each other (col 2, lines 5-10, two different frequencies). Kennan does not disclose a metal shielding box accommodating said plurality of local oscillators, wherein said metal shielding box includes only one shielding chamber accommodating said plurality of local oscillators and an electromagnetic coupling preventing member preventing electromagnetic coupling between one and another one of said dielectric resonators; said electromagnetic

coupling preventing member extending between any two of said dielectric resonators and receiving a reference potential.

Hwang et al disclose two dielectric resonators, a metal case and a screw arranged between the dielectric resonators (col 7, lines 43-52; figures 7A/7B) and Otremba et al show an oscillator with a dielectric resonator and a metal housing and metal covers (figure 1 and col 2, lines 12-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kennan to show a low noise block down converter, comprising: a plurality of local oscillators each including a dielectric resonator and having an oscillation frequency different from each other; and a metal shielding box accommodating said plurality of local oscillators, wherein said metal shielding box includes only one shielding chamber accommodating said plurality of local oscillators and an electromagnetic coupling preventing member preventing electromagnetic coupling between one and another one of said dielectric resonators; said electromagnetic coupling preventing member extending between any two of said dielectric resonators and receiving a reference potential, as taught by Hwang et al, the motivation being achieving optimum electromagnetic coupling (Hwang et al, col 4, lines 15-20), and Otremba et al, the motivation being to provide a dielectric resonator in a hermetically tight cavity inside a metal housing (Otremba et al, col 1, lines 34-37).

Referring to **claim 2**, Kennan discloses the low noise block down converter (col 1, lines 5-10, Low Noise Block Downconverters) and receiving a reference potential (col 3, lines 9-12, applying a first potential to the input) according to claim 1. Kennan and Otremba et al do not explicitly disclose that the electromagnetic coupling preventing member includes a conductive

Art Unit: 2617

bar having one end extending between any two of said dielectric resonators. Examiner maintains that the concept that the electromagnetic coupling preventing member includes a conductive bar having one end extending between any two of said dielectric resonators was well known in the art as taught by Hwang et al.

Hwang et al show a screw arranged between the dielectric resonators (col 7, lines 43-52; figures 7A/7B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kennan, Hwang et al and Otremba et al to show that the electromagnetic coupling preventing member includes a conductive bar having one end extending between any two of said dielectric resonators, as taught by Hwang et al, the motivation being achieving optimum electromagnetic coupling (Hwang et al, col 4, lines 15-20).

Referring to **claim 3**, Kennan discloses the low noise block down converter (col 1, lines 5-10, Low Noise Block Downconverters) and receiving a reference potential (col 3, lines 9-12, applying a first potential to the input) according to claim 1. Kenan and Otremba et al do not explicitly disclose a substrate having a surface on which said plurality of local oscillators are mounted, wherein said electromagnetic coupling preventing member includes a conductive pattern formed on the surface of said substrate between any two of said dielectric resonators. Examiner maintains that the concept that the electromagnetic coupling preventing member includes a conductive pattern formed on the surface of said substrate between any two of said dielectric resonators was well known in the art as taught by Hwang et al.

Hwang et al disclose a screw arranged between the dielectric resonators (col 7, lines 43-52; figures 7A/7B) and a dielectric substrate (col 7, lines 5-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kennan, Hwang et al and Otremba et al to show that the electromagnetic coupling preventing member includes a conductive pattern formed on the surface of said substrate between any two of said dielectric resonators, as taught by Hwang et al, the motivation being achieving optimum electromagnetic coupling (Hwang et al, col 4, lines 15-20).

Referring to **claim 4**, Kennan discloses the low noise block down converter (col 1, lines 5-10, Low Noise Block Downconverters) and receiving a reference potential (Kennan, col 3, lines 9-12, applying a first potential to the input) according to claim 1. Kennan and Otremba et al do not explicitly disclose that the electromagnetic coupling preventing member includes a metal plate provided between any two of said dielectric resonators. Examiner maintains that the concept that electromagnetic coupling preventing member includes a metal plate provided between any two of said dielectric resonators was well known in the art as taught by Hwang et al.

Hwang et al disclose a screw arranged between the dielectric resonators (col 7, lines 43-52; figures 7A/7B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kennan, Hwang et al and Otremba et al to show that the electromagnetic coupling preventing member includes a metal plate provided between any two of said dielectric resonators as taught by Hwang et al, the motivation being achieving optimum electromagnetic coupling (Hwang et al, col 4, lines 15-20).


*Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments, filed 5/1/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4922211 to Otremba et al.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suhail Khan whose telephone number is (571) 272-7910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8 am to 4:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sk

  
ERIKA A. GARY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER